



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,027	10/31/2000	Harry C. Blackmon	59182-PO12US-1002	9051

29053 7590 11/02/2004

DALLAS OFFICE OF FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. '
2200 ROSS AVENUE
SUITE 2800
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784

EXAMINER

TON, ANTHONY T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2661

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/703,027

Applicant(s)

BLACKMON ET AL.

Examiner

Anthony T Ton

Art Unit

2661

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-35.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____


PHIRIN SAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of the item 5:

Request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The claimed subject matter “**one and only one**”, which claimed in the claimed limitations “*each of the facility interface circuit cards is connected to one and only one said line card*”; “*such that one and only one said line card is connected to each of said paired duplicate interface circuit cards*”; and “*delivering said duplicate data streams from said two paired duplicate interface circuit cards to one and only one line card*” in the independent claims 1, 5, and 23, respectively, hasn't been described in the Applicants' specification.

Furthermore, such a connection (i.e. each of the facility interface circuit cards is connected to one and only one said line card) hasn't been clearly disclosed by the Applicants' drawings. Based on the Applicants' Figure 1A, it shows each (for example, 11-0W) of facility interface circuit cards not only connected to one line card (13-0), but it also connected to all the other line cards (13-1 to 13-4) via the other facility interface circuit cards (11-1W to 11-4W, respectively).

In addition, based on the prior art of the Oren et al. (US Patent No. 5,844,877) hereinafter refers to as Oren, such a connection of the Applicants cannot distinguish a difference between the claimed invention of the Applicants and the redundancy switching fabric of Oren because in a view of one port interface module 50 (facility interface circuit card) to one junction module 52 (line card) in a column fabric card, it still meets such a connection of the Applicants; moreover, such a “**one and only one**” of the claimed limitations of the Applicants hasn't been supported by the Applicants' sepecification.

Respectfully submitted,

by : 

Anthony T. Ton

Patent Examiner

October 27, 2004